manifesting and experiencing its various manifesta-
tions. That then is a Self which must be one in
its being,—otherwise we could not have this
•experience of unity,—and yet must be capable in-
its very unity of cosmic differentiation and multiple
individuality. The unity is its being,—yes, but the
cosmic differentiation and the multiple individuality
.are the power of its being which it is constantly
displaying and which it is its delight and the nature
of its consciousness to display. If then we arrive
at unity with that, if we even become entirely and
in every way that being, why should the power of
its being be excised and why at all should we
desire or labour to excise it? We should then only
diminish the scope of our unity with it by an
exclusive concentration accepting the divine being
but not accepting our part in the power and
'consciousness and infinite delight of the Divine. It
would in fact be the individual seeking peace and
rest of union in a motionless identity, but rejecting
•delight and various joy of union in the nature and
•act and power of the divine Existence. That is
possible, but there is no necessity to uphold it as
the ultimate aim of our being or as our

ultimate
perfection.

Or the one possible reason would be that in
the power, the act of consciousness there is not real
union and that only in the status of consciousness
is there perfect, undifferentiated unity. Now in
what we may call the waking union of the
individual with the Divine, as opposed to a falling